

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

NEVIN PARROS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHET RIGNEY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case 3:22-cv-00561-MMD-CLB

ORDER

Plaintiff Nevin Parros brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at Ely State Prison. (ECF No. 1-1.) On January 19, 2023, this Court ordered Parros to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee on or before March 20, 2023. (ECF No. 3.) The Court warned Parros that this action would be dismissed if he failed to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$402 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. (*Id.* at 2.) That deadline expired and Parros did not file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, pay the full \$402 filing fee, or otherwise respond.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. See *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the

1 public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its
2 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition
3 of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re*
4 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
5 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

6 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation
7 and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Parros's
8 claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal
9 because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing
10 a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542
11 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of
12 cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

13 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can
14 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider
15 dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining
16 that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order
17 does not satisfy this factor); accord *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th
18 Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that
19 “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's
20 order as satisfying this element[.]” *i.e.*, like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled
21 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[.]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).
22 Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a
23 case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
24 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and
25 unless Parros either files a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pays
26 the \$402 filing fee for a civil action, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting
27 another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays
28 the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The circumstances here do not


1 indicate that this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Parros needs additional
2 time or evidence that he did not receive the Court's order. Setting another deadline is not
3 a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

4 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they
5 weigh in favor of dismissal.

6 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
7 Parros's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the
8 full \$402 filing fee in compliance with this Court's January 19, 2023, order.

9 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
10 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Parros wishes to pursue his
11 claims, he must file a complaint in a new case.

12 DATED THIS 14th Day of April 2023.

13
14 
15 _____
16 MIRANDA M. DU
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28